

INFORMATION SHEET
DETERMINATIONS OF NO JURISDICTION FOR ISOLATED, NON-NAVIGABLE, INTRA-STATE WATERS
RESULTING FROM U.S. SUPREME COURT DECISION IN SOLID WASTE AGENCY OF NORTHERN COOK
COUNTY V. U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

DISTRICT OFFICE: St Paul District
FILE NUMBER: 04-161141-DJP

REGULATORY PROJECT MANAGER: Dale J. Pfeifle **Date:** December 8, 2004

PROJECT REVIEW/DETERMINATION COMPLETED: In the office Y (Y/N) **Date:** December 8, 2004
 At the project site (Y/N) **Date:**

PROJECT LOCATION INFORMATION:

State: Wisconsin
County: Racine
Center coordinates of site by latitude & longitudinal coordinates: 42.7719928825N, 88.1922236076W
Approximate size of site/property (including uplands & in acres): 40
Name of waterway or watershed: Upper Fox, Illinois, Wisconsin

SITE CONDITIONS:

| Type of aquatic resource ¹ | 0-1 ac | 1-3 ac | 3-5 ac | 5-10 ac | 10-25 ac | 25-50 ac | > 50 ac | Linear feet | Unknown |
|---------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|---------|----------|----------|---------|-------------|---------|
| Lake | | | | | | | | | |
| River | | | | | | | | | |
| Stream | | | | | | | | | |
| Dry Wash | | | | | | | | | |
| Mudflat | | | | | | | | | |
| Sandflat | | | | | | | | | |
| Wetlands | X | | | | | | | | |
| Slough | | | | | | | | | |
| Prairie pothole | | | | | | | | | |
| Wet meadow | | | | | | | | | |
| Playa lake | | | | | | | | | |
| Vernal pool | | | | | | | | | |
| Natural pond | | | | | | | | | |
| Other water (identify type) | | | | | | | | | |

¹Check appropriate boxes that best describe type of isolated, non-navigable, intra-state water present and best estimate for size of non-jurisdictional aquatic resource area.

| Migratory Bird Rule Factors ¹ : | If Known | | If Unknown Use Best Professional Judgment | | |
|---|----------|----|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
| | Yes | No | Predicted to Occur | Not Expected to Occur | Not Able To Make Determination |
| Is or would be used as habitat for birds protected by Migratory Bird Treaties? | | | X | | |
| Is or would be used as habitat by other migratory birds that cross state lines? | | | X | | |
| Is or would be used as habitat for endangered species? | | | | X | |
| Is used to irrigate crops sold in interstate commerce? | | | | X | |

¹Check appropriate boxes that best describe potential for applicability of the Migratory Bird Rule to apply to onsite, non-jurisdictional, isolated, non-navigable, intra-state aquatic resource area.

TYPE OF DETERMINATION: Preliminary Or **Approved** X.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SUPPORTING NJD (e.g., discussion may include information reviewed to assess potential navigation or interstate commerce connections - 1 to 3 paragraphs): A Corps jurisdictional determination was completed for the subject wetland on April 12, 2001. The subject wetland is one of 6 isolated wetlands located in the project area. The previous project review failed to identify any surface water connections between the subject wetland and a water of the US. In addition, an interstate commerce connection could not be established. The activity proposed at the site includes the dredging of a cattail fringe area and planting wetland root plugs in a effort to enhance the appearance of the wetland. The wetland would not be filled.